



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Design approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Implementation approval.

Part I - Project Information

Date:	April 14, 2010
Agency Name:	Department of Public Safety
Project Name:	Intelligence Bureau use of DPS Email Notification
Agency Manager:	SOA Steve Ponsetto
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	(515) 725-6306 / ponsetto@dps.state.ia.us
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Commissioner Meyer
Initial Total for Design:	\$60,000
Initial Total for Implementation:	\$60,000
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Design Start Date:05/01/2010 Design End Date:08/01/2010 Implementation Start Date:08/02/2010 Implementation End Date:12/01/2011
Revised Total for Design and Implementation:	\$120,000

Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:

\$

Part II - Project Overview

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

Response: Since the events of 9/11 extensive efforts have been made by the federal government, in consultation with the states, to create fusion centers. There are currently 72 designated fusion centers in the US (one in each state and 22 in major urban areas such as; New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, etc.). The designated fusion center in Iowa is at the Iowa Department of Public Safety – State of Iowa Intelligence Fusion Center (IFC)

The purpose of a fusion center is to create and enhance the ability to exchange information in a timely and effective manner with law enforcement and key public and private sector partners. More information may be seen in the publication on Fusion Center Guidelines: <http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/ise/guidelines.pdf>

The definition of a fusion center: A collaborative effort of two or more agencies that provide resources, expertise and/or information to the fusion center with a goal of maximizing the ability to detect, prevent, apprehend, and respond to criminal and/or terrorist activity

The State of Iowa Intelligence Fusion Center has the mission of: To lead and coordinate intelligence and homeland security efforts that protect Iowa, while upholding the Constitution

The IFC would like to add topics (sectors) to the current DPS Email Notification application. The sectors would be listed separately and mirror the 17 sectors currently in Iowa: Government, Energy, Emergency Services, Defense-Industrial, Dams, Commercial Facilities, Chemical, Banking-Finance, Agriculture-Food, Water, Transportation, Community Organizations, Public Health/Health Care, Postal-Shipping, Education Event Venues and Icons and Information Technology/Telecommunications.

In the event critical criminal or intelligence information needs to be disseminated within a sector(s) the proposed email notification system would be used.

Members of the IFC would approve all requests to join the proposed email notification system. The members will be notified via email when a request has been approved or denied. The request will be approved or disapproved using the Lyris Service. It has not yet been determined if the request and the approval or disapproval must be maintained in the application.

The automation of the email delivery will greatly decrease the amount of time spent by DPS/IFC employees in contacting those that have requested notification as well as it would create the ability to ensure that the correct people are getting the information. The individuals or companies who need notification will be assured they will receive the emails as long as they have done their part and signed up for the service.

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Response: This directly fits into the department's current policy on notification automation. DPS works closely with and is a key component of the Information Sharing Strategy. DPS along with Homeland Security Emergency Management Division (HSEMD) and its federal and local partners move forward with a sense of urgency to streamline our information sharing processes. There is a wealth of talent and understanding of local communities entrenched in State and local agencies that can spot suspicious activity and engage the community on homeland security issues in ways others cannot. The challenge is to manage consistent information sharing, and a

commitment to coordinate and participate in the State's information sharing and intelligence efforts with all public and private sector partners. This email notification system would be a crucial part of integrating this system.

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

Response: Currently, employees manually send out emails based on a list of names and email addresses. The names and addresses are not currently obtained in a systematic means.

The proposed project will automate the sending of emails to approved recipients by utilizing many pieces of the current DPS Email Notification application. The project will also enable the DPS to obtain names and email addresses in a systematic manner. In addition, the email addresses can be kept up to date by the user thereby eliminating the sending of emails to incorrect addresses.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

1. Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response: Fusion Centers are expected to create certain capabilities based upon Fusion Center Baseline Capabilities. This document can be viewed at:

<http://www.it.ojp.gov/documents/baselinecapabilitiesa.pdf>

One of the baseline capabilities is that the fusion center should create an ability to disseminate alerts, warnings, and notifications and other relevant analytical reports, to the affected critical infrastructure or private sector entity (sectors).

Goal #2 in the 2009 – 2014 Iowa Strategy for Homeland and Emergency Management is to strengthen Iowa's fusion system and ensure that information is disseminated rapidly, and on a need to know basis to all partners.

http://www.iowahomelandsecurity.org/Documents/Strategy_2009-2014.pdf

Presidential Directive concerning Information: Mandates that enable and support this goal reside at the highest levels of authority- from public law, Presidential Executive Orders, and National Strategies. The evolving United States national security environment provides a context that advances innovations to enhance the value of information sharing across DPS and other agencies.

2. Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response: See above

3. Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?



YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: This proposed notification ability would allow for key Iowa private and public sector entities to be notified of time sensitive critical homeland security information. The dissemination of this information would allow for recipients to: prepare, detect, deter or disrupt a potential vital situation as well as report any information back to law enforcement based upon the initial dissemination. This creates a two way communication stream which is vital to information sharing. Many of these entities are interdependent and the implementation of this system would ensure that parties in designated sectors authorized to receive sensitive information would receive it in a more consistent and timely manner.

4. Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?



YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Response: Yes – Due to automation of current manual procedures. Currently, the distributor of the information must manually select recipients based on who he or she believes “needs to know.” By automating the process via email notification, those who are authorized and signed up to receive updates relevant to each sector and any other predetermined criteria, would automatically receive the often sensitive information in a timely manner.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

1. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

Response: The Department of Public Safety (IFC) would disseminate the critical information to the 17 sectors in Iowa (each sector will have many approved users). This would also include approved members of Safeguard Iowa Partnership (SIP) and FBI Infragard, both are organizations that focus on key partnerships with non-law enforcement participants. Current events can have diverse and far-reaching impacts drawing DPS and HSEMD into operational scenarios with varied partners. The events of tomorrow cannot always be anticipated

and solutions must transcend today's scenarios and provide DPS/Fusion Center the ability to accommodate dynamically changing associations, external partners and information sharing requirements.

<http://www.safeguardiowa.org/>

<http://www.infragard.net/>

2. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Response: This project will provide enhanced protection/services to all sectors (and persons within each sector) who require timely email notification which is significant in protecting Iowans

3. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Response: Information mobility is the dynamic availability of information to be shared. Information mobility provides the foundation for shared and user-defined situational awareness. Trusted information must be made visibly accessible and understandable to any authorized user except where limited by law or policy. By sharing information efficiently and effectively among law enforcement agencies and other relevant partners, analysts and decision makers can receive a multitude of information from a variety of sources in real, or near-real time. The communications and outreach initiative must be a strategic, multi-agency effort to inform, involve and mobilize DPS/Fusion Center and its partners toward the information sharing vision. The goal of the email notification system is to coordinate information and a plan of action to protect life and critical infrastructure in the event of a natural or man-made catastrophe.

The design and implementation of this notification system will ensure the citizens of Iowa will receive timely notifications which will provide them with an interdependency which will benefit all citizens. The interconnectedness and the reliance on one another socially, economically, environmentally and politically provides a great benefit to the citizens of Iowa. This information will also provide the citizens with a resilience allowing them to have a positive capacity to cope with stress and catastrophe.

4. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Response: As with any major criminal or terrorist act, the consequences can be enormous. Beyond the loss of life there are potential economic effects, the damage to critical infrastructure such as electric grids, water and food supplies. The health and safety impact could be quite significant.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).



[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

F. Scope

1. Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project

Response:

2. Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response: This project is a continuation of the DPS Email Notification application (funded by lowAccess) which has been in use since January, 2007. The Email Notification application has saved DPS countless hours spent in notifying interested persons on many items of interest and security.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

G. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response: All funds will come from lowAccess. Examination of the availability of Homeland Security funds is being pursued.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



Part III – Design Proposal

Amount of Design Funding Requested: \$

A. Process Reengineering

1. Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

2. Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Design phase of the project. Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database design. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

C. Spending Plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Design Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:

1. One Year Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	\$

2. One Year Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$

Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	\$

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated one year value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	
Hours saved/transaction:	
Number of Citizens affected:	
Value of Citizen Hour	\$
Total Transaction Savings:	\$
Other Savings (Describe)	\$
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	\$

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated one year non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc

Response:

5. Design Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

6. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Part IV – Implementation Funding

Amount of Implementation Funding Requested: \$

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$

Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Implementation phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

B. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project-related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Totals	\$		%	\$	%	\$

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance – Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

3. Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E)	\$	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Response:

2. Citizen impact

Response:

3. Cost Savings

Response:

4. Project reengineering

Response:

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response:

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Response:

Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Design Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Implementation Phase:

